

AARA in view of Deering and Boucher et al. (Boucher), U.S. Patent No. 6,434,620. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants maintain the argument presented in the Amendment filed December 5, 2005. Applicants herein provide the following explanation as to why the combination of AARA, Deering and Boucher fails to disclose or suggest an IP address setting device with an address information designation unit that includes a display that displays a list with at least a portion of nodes that transmitted response packets and a selection unit that enables a user to select from the list the node to be set with address information, as recited in claim 2; an IP address setting device with an address information designation unit that includes a display unit that displays in a list at least a portion of network printers at nodes that transmitted a response packet, as recited in claim 3; and an IP address setting method with the steps of displaying a list of at least a portion of network printers connected to a network based on the MAC address in the response packet, and determining selection of a network printer from the list by a user, as recited in claim 7.

Page 3 of the Office Action refers to page 1, lines 14-20 of Applicants' specification to assert that AARA discloses the display and selection unit as recited in claims 2, 3 and 7. However, page 1, lines 14-20 of Applicants' specification discusses a first method and a second method by which address information can be set for a device. In the first method, a user inputs address information by operating input buttons of the network device while watching a display unit that is attached to the network device. The second method fails to provide any disclosure or suggestion with regard to using a display or a selection unit.

Page 1, lines 14-20 of Applicants' specification fails to provide any disclosure or suggestion with regard to using the display of the first method to display a list with at least a portion of nodes that transmitted response packets or allowing a user to select from the list the node to be set with address information, as variably recited in claims 2, 3 and 7. As discussed

on page 1, lines 14-16 of Applicants' specification, a display is provided for each network device for which an address is to be input. Because a display is provided for each network device, if this is the exclusive method used, there is no suggestion or motivation with regard to using the display to display a list with at least a portion of nodes that transmitted response packets. Further in such a method, no packets are transmitted. The second method (lines 17-19) only describes a host computer to set addresses using a transmission protocol other than TCP/IP.

The Office Action attempts to combine the first method and the second method (page 1, lines 14-20) with the third method (page 1, line 20 - page 2, line 5). This attempt to combine the methods is not correct because each method uses a different approach to setting address information (a user sets address information at each device in the first method and a host computer sets address information in the third method) and each method suffers deficiencies as discussed on page 2, lines 7-23 of Applicants' specification.

Page 4 of the Office Action appears to admit that AARA fails to disclose the display of claims 2, 3, and 7. Applicants note that their invention cannot be used to provide motivation to combine references.

As admitted in the Interview Summary, AARA fails to disclose the display of claims 2, 3 and 7. However, the Interview Summary states that network monitoring arts such as Novel's network manager reads on at least the display aspect, where the network manager displays the network status of network device information/status to the user. Applicants do not agree with this analysis because the Examiner has not identified Novel (and thus Applicants are not able to evaluate what Novel discloses) and the Examiner has not provided any indication where Novel discloses displaying a list with at least a portion of nodes that transmitted response packets, as variably recited in claims 2, 3 and 7.

The Interview Summary also argues that because a user programmed the third method of AARA, a user actually selects from a list a node to be set with address information (claim 2) and selects a network printer from a list (claim 7). This logic is not correct. AARA, third method (page 1, line 25), explicitly states that a host computer selects a network device. Although a program may have been written by a programmer (and not a user), a user selecting a node or a network printer from a list is not the same as a host computer selecting a network printer.

Deering fails to overcome the deficiencies of AARA because Deering fails to disclose a display and a selection unit, as variably recited in claims 2, 3 and 7. Furthermore, Boucher (in particular, col. 56, lines 51-63) fails to disclose the display of claim 3.

It is respectfully requested that the rejections be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Scott M. Schulte
Registration No. 44,325

JAO:SMS/sxb

Date: March 20, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--